

PHOMP Stakeholder Summary
Comments received on Question 8: Anything to Add?
On-line Stakeholder Input

Question Background and Response Data

8. Consider the framework as whole, is there anything you would you like to ADD or CHANGE?

115 respondents provided feedback to this question.

466 respondents skipped this question.

581 Total respondents to the survey

This survey is not statistically valid as it was targeted to a specific public health population (750+ partners) and all public health employees.

Note: Comments are as written with the exception for correction for spelling.

Overview:

1. Of the 115 comments provided, the vast majority of the comments provided general public health comment or comments that would be helpful in setting priorities in Phase II of the OMP.

Staff will continue to review, analyze, and summarize these comments for the Steering Committee.

2. There were a set of comments that were suggestions or specifically related to the framework. Those that have themes that are not already addressed either in the comments received on the guiding principles or factors to prioritize are summarized and attached here.

Overall comments: “Be outcome based”:

“I suggest adding a guiding principle: 'Be outcome based' of something to that effect. Set clear goals, big, ambitious goals that will necessarily involve many entities beyond the local public health department. Then develop strategies in collaboration with many partners. Public Health's role should be the convener, the catalyst, for these regional health goals. Maybe much of the work and the cost is borne by others. Just a thought.”

“How disappointing that every one of the 9 'guiding principles' is a process rather than an outcome! Of course government should 'assure access'--but why? In order to reduce morbidity due to selected health outcomes.”

“The policy framework could better clarify core responsibilities and essential services by addressing community results the policies ought to accomplish. For instance, the policy regarding prevention and health promotion might read: 'King County values prevention of poor health conditions as the most cost effective avenue to achieve optimum health and reduce avoidable hospitalizations.' 'Optimum health' is not a measurable goal. Adding a community result, such as 'reduce avoidable hospitalizations', provides a performance indicator to measure the effectiveness of public health investments (i.e., reduction in number of people hospitalized for illnesses that would not normally require hospitalization). It also better focuses limited public health resources to health factors for which hospitalization would not normally be necessary (i.e., pneumonia / influenza immunizations). For these reasons, among others -- the Steering Committee might want to re-examine a shorten list of guiding principles for the purpose of identifying and adding the community results they hope to achieve.”

Strategic Planning:

First, we are pleased to see a strong emphasis on the health department’s role in system-wide planning and coordination. The health department has a unique and critical role in the local health care system as an impartial convener of that system. Collection, analysis and dissemination of epidemiological and other data are all necessary for all community partners to understand trends, meet community needs, and adapt over time. Identifying and convening key players in the public health system for the purposes of planning and coordination is something only government can do. The health department has unique resources – human, financial and technological – that can be used to identify and monitor trends, educate the community, and support complex planning and coordination activities.

Role of Public Health and Uses of the Framework:

“It should also more clearly articulate the role of Public Health in building/supporting/leading the public health system. The framework should be more explicit in how it will be used to determine the services/activities for which King County government will take responsibility. I know that the level of services will always be dependent on available resources, but the County should indicate the services it will fund and seek resources for - in other words, what it will take responsibility for. The framework should be used in Phase II and beyond to assure that Public Health's funding and organizational structure are aligned with its priorities.”

“Since we all know money is tight, the implication of the above is PH will continue to do many things OK rather than a few things very well. I don't see that this effort has made any tough choices.”